

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,084	02/03/2006	Kazuhiro Yanagisawa	Q92943	2328
23373 7590 04/29/2008 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			SCOTT, ANGELA C	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1796		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/595.084 YANAGISAWA ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit ANGELA C. SCOTT 1796 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2008. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response of February 5, 2008 has been fully considered. Claims 10 and 11 have been amended and claims 1-11 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagisawa et al. (US 2003/0088006).

Regarding claim 1, Yanagisawa et al. teaches a method for producing a rubber master batch comprising the step of mixing a rubber latex (rubber solution) with a slurry of a filler dispersed into water (¶19).

Yanagisawa et al. does not teach that the mixing of the rubber solution and the slurry solution takes place in either a static mixer or a high shear mixer comprising a rotor and a stator portion. However, Yanagisawa et al. does teach that the aqueous slurry of filler is prepared by using a high-shear mixer of rotor-stator type (¶36). At the time of the invention, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use a high-shear mixer of rotor-stator type to mix not only the slurry solution, as taught by Yanagisawa et al., but the rubber solution and the slurry solution together, and would have been motivated to do so because using a high-

Application/Control Number: 10/595,084

Art Unit: 1796

shear mixer will give the predictable result of dispersing one phase or ingredient (liquid, solid, gas) into a main continuous phase (liquid), with which it would normally be immiscible.

Regarding claim 2, Yanagisawa et al. additionally teaches that the filler is selected from the group consisting of carbon black, silica, and an inorganic filler represented by the following formula:

wherein M_1 is at least one member selected from the group consisting of metals of aluminum, magnesium, titanium, calcium or zirconium, oxides of the preceding metals, hydraxides of the preceding metals, hydraxes of the preceding oxides and hydroxides, and carbonates of the preceding metals; n is an integer of 1 to 5, x is an integer of 0 to 10, y is an integer of 2 to 5, and z is an integer of 0 to 10 (1%13-14).

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Yanagisawa et al. additionally teaches that the rubber solution is a natural rubber latex (¶19).

Regarding claim 5, Yanagisawa et al. additionally teaches that the amide linkages in the natural rubber latex are cleaved with a protease (1119 and 21).

Regarding claim 6, Yanagisawa et al. additionally teaches when the natural rubber latex (rubber solution) is mixed with the slurry solution, the mixture is coagulated (¶42) and has a water content of preferably 10% or more (¶45) and then the mixture is dried by applying a mechanical shearing force (¶44).

Regarding claim 7, Yanagisawa et al. additionally teaches that the drying under shear force can be carried out by using a known kneader, preferably by a continuous kneader in view Application/Control Number: 10/595,084

Art Unit: 1796

of industrial productivity. More preferably, a corotating or counterrotaing twin-screw kneading extruder is used (a screw-type continuous milling machine) (¶44).

Regarding claim 8, Yanagisawa et al. additionally teaches a natural rubber master batch obtained by the above methods (¶46).

Regarding claim 9. Yanagisawa et al. additionally teaches a natural rubber composition prepared by using the natural rubber master batch (¶47).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Yanagisawa et al. additionally teaches that the rubber composition is applicable to tire applications as well as belts (¶115).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 5, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is true that Yanagisawa et al. does not teach using a high-shear mixer to mix the rubber solution and the slurry solution. However, high-shear mixers are common pieces of equipment in the art and one of ordinary skill in the art would know that high-shear mixers work well for dispersing one phase or ingredient (liquid, solid, gas) into a main continuous phase (liquid), with which it would normally be immiscible. Additionally, Yanagisawa et al. teaches all other aspects of the method and composition and simply mixing the rubber solution and slurry solution in a different way may produce different, even better, results, but the results are not unexpected.

Art Unit: 1796

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela C. Scott whose telephone number is (571) 270-3303. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30am to 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on (571) 272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/595,084 Page 6

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MARK EASHOO/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796 27-Apr-08 /A. C. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 1796